Application No. Applicant(s) Damsohn et al. 08/743,002 Interview Summary Art Unit Examiner 3743 Leonard R. Leo All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Leonard R. Leo (2) Richard A. Diefendorf Date of Interview May 21, 2002 Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) ☑ Personal [copy is given to 1] ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: All Identification of prior art discussed: Karbach et al and Brzezinski Agreement with respect to the claims f) \square was reached. g) \square was not reached. h) \square N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: discussed the proposed amendment reciting "attaching the lugs to opposite walls of the tubes" is believed met by the combination of Karbach et al and Brzezinski, where the prior art discussed by Brzezinski discloses welding lugs directly to the walls as opposed to inserting a sheet with lugs. However, maintaining the primary reference of Karbach et al without distruction, only the insert portion with the lugs contacting the tube walls would be modified with welded lugs onto the tube wallls. This amendment to the claim would not be entered when submitted in After Final amendment, since it requires further consideration. A proposed amendment with respect to deletion of part (a) of the claim and reciting "integrally molding the lugs" in part (b) of the claim would overcome the references in the grounds of rejection, but would also be an impermissible shift in the election of species. Figure 3a was elected earlier in the prosecution. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) i) lt is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

> LEONARD R. LEO PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 3743

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

22. (Four times amended) A method of manufacturing a heat exchanger for cooling exhaust gas of an internal-combustion engine, said method comprising the steps of:

providing a plurality of rectangular tubes for guiding exhaust gas;

arranging a plurality of lugs in said rectangular tubes diagonally to a flow direction of the exhaust gas, in pairs, by one of (a) directly attaching the lugs to opposite walls of said tubes and (b) integrally forming the lugs from said opposite walls of said tubes;

providing first and second latticed tube bottoms;

welding ends of said rectangular tubes to said latticed tube bottoms such that said rectangular tubes form a bundle;

attaching a sheet metal jacket to said tube bottoms and around said bundle;

providing said sheet metal jacket with a coolant inlet and a coolant outlet to allow a liquid coolant to flow around said rectangular tubes in said sheet metal jacket; and

attaching connections to said tube bottoms, to ends of said sheet metal jacket, or to both said tube bottoms and ends of said sheet metal jacket, said connections being configured for attachment to an exhaust pipe communicated with the exhaust gas from the internal-combustion engine, each said connection defining a central opening for communicating said rectangular tubes with the exhaust pipe.